DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 278 SP 039 028

AUTHOR Cole, Donna J.; Ramey, Linda
TITLE Joining Forces: A Collaborative Venture To Develop Exemplary Field Partnership School Sites.
PUB DATE 2000-02-00
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (80th, Orlando, FL, February 12-16, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Mentors; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Praxis Series

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a recent collaboration between a public university teacher education preparation program, a large urban school district, and a neighboring suburban school district. It highlights the professional experiences of teacher education interns who entered the field from prior professions or training. Candidates were immersed in an intensive 15-month program. Candidates had to learn and show proficiency in Praxis III domains and criteria. This collaboration resulted in the creation of several partnership school sites, which allowed direct placement of pre-service teachers with selected in-service teachers. Classroom teachers participated in professional development on mentoring pre-service teachers and models of clinical supervision, including Pathwise/Praxis training. This joint venture, which included school-site interviews by a team of university and school partners, ensured higher quality field experiences by permitting flexibility and purposeful selection of placements. The paper presents preliminary findings and lessons learned along the way. Evidence indicates that this professional educator program proved dynamic and enriching for beginning practitioners. Interns highly valued all field internship work, and teachers believed the interns made major differences in their students' lives. Teachers were motivated to undertake extensive renewal activities. University faculty experienced the real world of day-to-day teaching. (Contains 12 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 438 278

Joining Forces:

A Collaborative Venture to Develop

Exemplary Field Partnership School Sites

Presented at:

The National Field Directors Forum
With the

Association Of Teacher Educators
80th Annual Meeting
Orlando, Florida
February 12-16, 2000

Donna J. Cole, Ph.D.
Professor & Director
Office of Professional Field Experiences
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio
&
Linda Ramey, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor & Middle Childhood Advisor
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio

SP039028

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. J. Cole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Joining Forces:

A Collaborative Venture to Develop Exemplary Field Partnership School Sites

This presentation highlights recent efforts to create a collaborative between a public university teacher education preparation program and a large urban school district as well as a neighboring suburban school district. This collaborative resulted in creation of several partnership school sites which allows direct placement of pre-service teachers with selected in-service teachers. The classroom teachers participated in a professional development sequence on mentoring pre-service teachers and models of clinical supervision, including Pathwise/PRAXIS training. This joint venture, which includes school-site interviews by a team of university and school partners, ensures higher quality field experiences by permitting flexibility and purposeful selection of placements. Preliminary findings and lessons learned along the way will be presented and discussed. A current problem needing resolution will be provided for participant discussion or in-put and discussion.

Joining Forces:

A Collaborative Venture to Develop Exemplary Field Partnership School Sites

Introduction

This paper focuses on the professional experiences of teacher education interns who enter the field from prior professions or training. Candidates are immersed in an intensive fifteen-month program, which compresses the traditional three years of professional training into 69-82 credit hours of coursework and a full-time internship. This program has some significant "lessons learned" to pass-on to other teacher educators. In addition to demonstration of professional competence, high stress levels dealing with student conflict, and family as well as personal pressures that must be mastered by these interns; they must also learn and show performance of the Praxis III Domains and Criteria. These 19 Criteria are demonstrated by an electronic portfolio. Further, the paper addresses the use of PRAXIS III/ Pathwise in the training and orientation of both Professional Educator Program (PEP) interns and professional clinical faculty mentoring these students in the urban setting.

Rather than the year intern placement in primary partner schools, etc., WSU is now contemplating varying the year placement.

Two objectives frame the paper content. These are:

1. To describe both the Professional Educator Program and WSU Partnership Efforts.
2. To explore WSU development of urban/suburban sites to address state/NCATE mandates.

As the twentieth century came to a close, educators became even more accountable for school improvements that, reportedly, occurred during the last two decades. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

public wants evidence that their schools are improving. The following renewal project provides such evidence.

Historical Overview of Wright State Redesign Efforts

Partners Transforming Education: School•University•Community is a process model to plan and articulate the simultaneous renewal of the education of educators and the PreK-12 sector. The College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, has been formally involved in this ongoing process to bring about systemic change to Pre-K - higher education since January, 1992. *Partners Transforming Education* has involved over 430 people representative of the PreK-12 sector, business, human service agencies, the University, the military, and others, to give input on the changes needed to create a new culture of collaborative educators responsive to society's needs.

Individuals from the PreK-12 sector, working with this initiative are classroom teachers and administrators representative of a number of school systems within the Dayton metropolitan area that Wright State University serves. With the amount of criticism aimed at the public schools and the growing concern about teacher education programs, educators can no longer work in isolation. The College has faced the challenge and invited not only the PreK-12 sector to join in problem solving, but has turned to the University at large and the Community to work collaboratively in building a program that will prepare more qualified pre-service teachers and renew PreK-12 and higher education faculties and administrators.

This concept of "simultaneous renewal" of both PreK-12 and Teacher Education surfaced as an essential component of advancement efforts. No partnership can exist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

where only one partner grows and benefits. As Goodlad establishes in *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* (1994) working together must be mutually advantageous.

Partners Transforming Education is moving forward the newly designed teacher education curricula, a conceptualized post baccalaureate professional school model, and formally established partnership school sites within PreK-12 schools. Classroom teachers, school administrators, arts and sciences faculty, education and human services faculty, and community representatives will continue serving as integral collaborators in the ongoing process for renewal. All partners are actively involved in professional development activities and a re-designed governance structure. The College of Education and Human Services at Wright State University functions as one of sixteen member sites of John I. Goodlad's National *Network for Educational Renewal* and is currently a selected member of the *National Education Association's Center for Innovation, Teacher Education Initiative.* These initiatives contribute significantly to moving the College agenda forward by focusing our energy and resources on the College's fundamental commitment: *"Working with others to better understand and improve the human condition."*

The partner schools and districts also have an identified agenda of specific goals and improvements. The partnership goal focuses on moving the agenda of both parties forward.

The University/School District Partnership Agreement

As suggested by the NNER, Wright State University develops a written *Partnership Agreement with* school systems requesting partnerships. The *Agreement* serves as a working document to articulate the purposes and direction of the collaboration. The four partnership purposes established by the NNER and supported by the WSU Partnership are:

1. Creating and sustaining learning communities which enables PreK-12 learners and partners to construct meaningful knowledge;
2. Preparing Educators;
3. Providing Professional Development; and
4. Conducting Inquiry (*NNER Compact For Partnership Schools*, 1994).

After several drafts, the final working document was agreed upon by both administrations. The document includes the following mission statement: *The mission of the Public School District/Wright State University Partnership is the simultaneous renewal of teacher education and PreK-12 education.* (*Dayton Public Schools & Wright State University Working Document*, 1998).

Also included in the document are Partnership Goals, Partnership Principles, Partnership Outcomes, Partnership Supporting Actions, Partner Commitment and Governance Principles. An Intern Policy Statement was attached to the document to assure clear understanding of joint expectations of the university students.

The Professional Educator Program

Wright State University (WSU) is a metropolitan state-supported university dedicated to the educational, social, and cultural needs of the Dayton area with an enrollment of 17,000 graduate and undergraduate students. WSU is especially proud of the Professional Educator Program (PEP). The PEP is the culmination of earlier college

efforts and membership in John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Relationships with the above organizations served as a factor in the college becoming one of 18 college and university partners in the Teacher Education initiative of its National Center for Innovation (NCI-EN).

The program uses the medical school model that permits a select group of post baccalaureate students to practice the art and science of teaching in a clinical environment. The strength of the program is that the interns experience the total ecology of the school beginning the summer prior to and concluding the summer following the school year. The interns earn their teaching certificate (license) in 15 months. They build on their undergraduate degree to become a certified/licensed Ohio teacher.

The program consists of student interns who are housed in public schools. The interns are individuals who have undergraduate degrees and who have enjoyed professional success in the military, business, and other careers. Schoolteachers who voluntarily complete a workshop serve as clinical faculty members in partnership with Wright State University (WSU). The clinical faculty provide a learning laboratory that is rich in problem solving and collaborative teaching and learning opportunities. These clinical faculty serve as mentors to supervise the interns in cohort groups and demonstrate dynamic teaching. As a result, public school students in primary through 12th grades gain from the fluid and cooperative interaction of professional educator interns, clinical faculty, and other school personnel. The college will use information from the PEP and the experiences of partners to facilitate future involvement of other school districts in the region.

Wright State University is located in Fairborn, Ohio, yet borders Dayton, thus formal relationships were established with the Dayton Public Schools (DPS) and Fairborn City Schools in 1987. The student population of DPS is approximately 65% African-American while the remaining 34% share an Appalachian heritage and the remaining 1% reflect other ethnic groups. The environment, in which these students live and grow, demands positive professional role models representative of the students being taught, as well as diverse models from our pluralistic society.

Dayton teachers, administrators and human service agencies have been instrumental in W.S.U.'s renewal efforts. The professional education program was first housed in the original WSU/DPS partnership school, E.J. Brown Elementary School. This school, E.J. Brown Elementary, has a magnet theme of (multi-aged) Integrated Learning. The student population consists of 549 children of which 70% are African American, 20% are white, and 10% other. The school is located in a lower middle-class neighborhood which has many large, uniquely designed homes. The students, however, are bused from the northern zone of the district. Sixty-nine percent of the students are at or below the poverty level. E.J. Brown is a school-wide Title I school because all of its students receive free lunches. The demographics of the staff consist of 30% African American and 70% European Americans. Although the school proficiency test scores are below the state standard, the scores reflect an increase from 1997 to 1998.

W.S.U. had piloted segments of the new program previously at E.J. Brown, and for several years has housed W.S.U.'s undergraduate certification block program students at this site. Therefore, a history was established. The history, however, had peaks and valleys and a need to carefully craft the yearlong program was indicated.

Another site, Dunbar High School, a WSU secondary DPS Partner School, is located in the western edge of Dayton. Recognized as a predominately African American area, Dunbar has an enrollment of 872 (of which 85 are European American). Most of the 85 white students have an Appalachian heritage, and live in the southeastern section of Dayton. Many of the African American students are also bused to Dunbar because of the vastness of Dayton's west side.

Fairborn City Schools' (FCS) student population is approximately 6,000 students. The majority of the students come from the working and professional classes. FCS have a strong Appalachian heritage as well as being influenced by Wright Patterson Air Force Base. The base fosters a transient student population with 1/4 of the students moving annually. FCS have 86.5% Anglo, 6.5% African American and 7% representing others. The district has 1468 on reduced (428) or free (1040) lunches. The teaching staff is seasoned and has many nationally certified educators.

Clinical Faculty Seminar

In alignment with the Goodlad philosophy and that of the WSU faculty, a seminar is offered for schools entering into partnerships. Those teachers completing the seminar are eligible to serve as mentors for an intern in the fall. W.S.U.'s President and Provost agreed to sponsor the seminar (one credit hour) at no expense to the teacher or district. The purposes of the workshop centered on: reviewing the partnership intent and identifying Governance Councils' structures; reflecting upon Goodlad's *Educational Renewal*; identifying topics of interest for professional development (Topics were: Clinical Supervision, Technology and Alternative Assessment); identifying renewal projects for

the school and individual participants; finalizing PEP arrangements at each site; and, most importantly--developing trust and clear two-way communication channels. The workshop readings included Goodlad's *Educational Renewal* and other related readings.

Selection of PEP Candidates

Both clinical faculty and the university academic faculty viewed the selection of the interns as crucial to the success of the PEP. The steps for admission to the PEP involved: request of transcripts to the Graduate Studies Office and the Certification Office (to insure prerequisite coursework was completed); applying for admissions to the university, School of Graduate Studies; completing the application for the Professional Educator Program; taking the Graduate Record Exam (GRE or MAT); and completing the PEP Interview, conducted by interviewers from partnership schools and university faculty.

The PEP application requires either a GRE score of 800 or better or MAT score of 30+, proof of acceptance to Graduate School, copy of transcript analysis, writing sample, two letters of recommendation, one from a faculty member in their content area and one from an employer, advisor or supervisor, self assessment of career goals, signed character statement for the State of Ohio, documentation of basic skills in keyboarding/word processing and use of electronic searching tools, i.e. CD-ROM, and transcripts of undergraduate work with GPA of 2.75 or better.

The interview process is a significant ingredient of intern selection. Some pre-teaching skills can not be identified via paper. The interview reveals a human perspective. Through pre-interview preparation the interviewers have identified a series of questions appropriate for the actual interviews. The questions fall into four categories:

1) commitment to the teaching field, 2) knowledge of the professional role, 3) appropriate motivation toward the field, and, 4) realistic appraisal of personal liabilities. The Candidate Evaluation Interview Form centered on these categories. Each interviewer placed a form in the intern's file. The scores were averaged and the results were considered in the final selection decision.

Field Program Overview

A. Summer

The PEP Program begins during the summer school. Four academic courses are offered on campus with one field experience. For the academic course, the interns attend three classes everyday for the first five weeks of the term. The second five weeks interns work all morning daily in year-round schools (not in the school district where they will spend the school year). They return to the university for one class in the afternoon (two days a week). The four academic courses: ED 602 *Philosophy and Instruction With All Populations;* ED 621 *Human Development;* ED 622 *Instructional Design and Technology;* and ED 709 *Reading Diagnosis* are team taught by university faculty. An authentic assessment requirement (The Professional Portfolio) due at the completion of the school year is introduced.

Before beginning fall term, the district requests state temporary substitute teaching certificates. These certificates permit interns to cover class if the lead teacher is involved in renewal projects as well as for liability reasons. The school site advisory councils decided to permit interns to substitute in the lead teacher's classroom if the interns were

in the field on the day of the teacher's absence and if it did not interfere with university course requirements.

B. Fall

The interns start fall term in the classrooms where they will spend the academic year. By having no university responsibilities, interns become acclimated into the 'total ecology of the school'. University classes begin the third week and some classes are held at public school buildings. The interns take five courses.

The elementary intern field experience is enhanced by a rotation schedule developed by the district elementary lead teachers, which provided exposure to a variety of "specials." Included in the rotation are all special education classes, including MH, DH, LD, and SLD, in addition to Speech, Gifted, Art, Music, Physical Education, and Chapter I. Elementary Interns are also exposed to various age levels within the elementary building site.

During the first two weeks of December, when the university class work is completed, a rotation schedule, more extensive than the elementary rotation was implemented throughout the school. Believing that the interns benefit from exposure to all student age levels, elementary interns are required to visit kindergarten, junior, and senior high classrooms. Secondary interns at the junior high are placed at the senior high for three days, and conversely the interns placed at the senior high are switched to the junior high for three days.

A unique feature to the junior and senior high alternative field placement is the student shadowing experience. Each intern is assigned a public school student to follow

throughout the course of a typical school day. This provides much needed one on one attention to the individual public school students.

The remainder of the December field experience is spent in the original intern field placements. Advisory Councils at all buildings thought this to be an invaluable opportunity to orient interns into the typical "holiday craziness" all schools experience before Winter break.

C. Winter

Winter term, the interns have three full day of field experience (Attachment A). Some university courses, like that of fall, are held at school sites.

The interns have the week between winter and spring terms, referred to as Clinical Field Experience II, to plan and research their full time internship teaching. Beginning with the first week of spring term, interns teach everyday, all day. Variations can and do occur such as some interns make plans to team-teach.

D. Summer

During the first five-week session of summer school, interns put the finishing touches on their professional electronic PRAXIS portfolio (as mentioned previously), by taking ED 645 *Internship Assessment*. The second summer class required ED 646 *Design of Induction Year Project*, assists interns in inquiry topics for their upcoming entry year of teaching. Although interns received certification by successfully completing the coursework and internships, the master's degree is awarded only after the successful execution of the inquiry project as well as demonstration of successful classroom teaching.

The final project serves as accountability of the research, classroom teaching or related work fulfilling the instruction requirement. By keeping in contact during the interns' induction year, a support channel is provided.

Overview of PRAXIS/Pathwise

In an effort to assure Ohio students, parents and communities that the state's teaching force has the necessary knowledge base and proficiency to adequately address students needs, the State of Ohio has determined to *use The PRAXIS SERIES: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers.* This series constitutes a system designed to assess the skills of beginning teachers. While one component of the *PRAXIS SERIES,* the *PRAXIS II: Subject Assessments,* is intended to assess prospective teachers' depth and knowledge of subject matter and pedagogical principles, newly adopted state licensure standards mandate a performance-based evaluation of teaching skills from within the context of a specific classroom setting. The PRAXIS III is a complementary assessment developed with this specific context in mind. Founded upon the basic assumptions that effective teaching requires both action and decision making and that learning is a process of active knowledge construction, the assessment was developed to reflect both the art and science of teaching. Moreover, it was designed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to be a reliable and valid measure of teaching performance likely to meet the rigors of subsequent legal challenges. The PRAXIS III criteria were derived from a national research base with input from 2,000 educators from diverse backgrounds from across the country. It was developed for use in teacher licensing decisions made by states or local agencies empowered to license teachers and was not designed for the purpose of

employment decisions. As such, the intent of ETS was from the outset to develop a national consensus on the important aspects of teaching and to translate that consensus into a framework for decision-making which is both informed by theoretical and policy perspectives of both educators and researchers.

Lessons Learned

As with any educational experience, reflections illustrate both positive and negative lessons learned. We are most appreciative for Dr. Goodlad and his leadership team for the many lessons they learned, and subsequently shared so that we benefited from their experience.

One of the richest ideas articulated by the Goodlad and senior associates' philosophy was the need to establish governance or advisory councils. The E.J. Brown Advisory council proved imperative. The advisory council, representing all the key players (interns, teachers, principal and WSU faculty) in the program made decisions about the day to day operation of the PEP and building renewal efforts. Major decisions coming out of the council included: attendance policy and procedures for professional days, absenteeism and personal days, substituting procedures, and renewal trip arrangements.

Another idea developed from Dr. Goodlad, et. al., supported having the Partner School collaborate on renewal. The Advisory Council identified a yearlong renewal effort which they desired to explore. E.J. Brown clinical faculty identified the multiage grouping as their inquiry topic.

Examples of Other Positive Lessons Learned Include:

- *Interns highly valuing all field internship work;*
- *Teachers validated that interns made major differences in PreK-6 students lives;*
- *Teachers were motivated to undertake extensive renewal activities;*
- *Teachers verified that they were more focused on personal excellence when entrusted with apprenticing a future educator;*
- *University faculty experienced the real world of day to day teaching;*
- *Intern problems were addressed quickly through concern conferences (five in fall term alone); and*
- *Interns bonded with each other as support groups.*

The list of the liabilities was approached in a positive manner. It highlights those elements which must be addressed. These challenges and lessons learned include:

- *Interns must identify financial resources and support system for the year.*
- *Interns and clinical faculty due process for disagreements/concerns must be clarified.*
- *Teachers desire input into university curriculum and practice;*
- *Better avenues for communication must be established.*
- *More university attention is needed at the school site.*
- *Flexibility and civility must be stressed in initial summer coursework: i.e. classroom placement, syllabi or participants.*

In Summary

Evidence indicates that this "Professional Educator Program" proved dynamic and enriching for beginning practitioners. These interns are exposed to and participated in over a year of field experience. They are ready; their PRAXIS-based electronic portfolios

demonstrate teaching proficiency in the four crucial domains and visually display their commitment and ability to teach and make a difference in students' lives. We feel that the public can ask if these interns are more competent teachers and we can answer that these educators are most certainly better prepared.

However, we are now faced with a field-based ethical and accreditation dilemma. After carrying on conversations with past interns we found that those interns spending the academic year in suburban placements had difficulty if hired in urban settings. Thus we desire to provide all interns with a quality extended urban experience. On the other hand, our clinical faculty as well as our interns are concerned that the rich learning experience of the yearlong practicum maybe diluted. All voices cite that starting and completing the year with the same group of students is most beneficial. Interns acquire a clear understanding of the "Total ecology of the school" and the yearlong requirements at the given school site. Please join us in a discussion to share ideas and assist us in our search for an educationally sound decision on field placements.

References

Farr, R. (1990 October). Integrating language arts programs. State Department Leadership Development Institute, Columbus.

Goodlad, J. (1994). Education renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for out nation's schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Killion, J. and Todnem, G. (1991 March). A process for personal theory building. Educational Leader, pp. 14-16.

Milestone one: A synthesis report. (Available from the College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45435)

Milestone two: A synthesis report. (Available from the College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45435)

NNER Compact for Partnership Schools. (1994)

Paulson, L. and Paulson, P. (1990, August 15). How do portfolios measure up? A cognitive model for assessing portfolios. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Northwest Evaluation Association.

Rybczynski, M. (1991 Spring). Understanding a portfolio approach to writing assessment. Ohio Journal of English Language Arts, pp. 34-38.

Sizor, T. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Shulman, L. (1988 November) "A union of insufficiencies: strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. Educational Leadership, pp. 36-41.

Shulman, L. Bird, T. and Haertel, E. (1989). Toward Alternative Assessments of Teaching: A Report of Work in Progress. Stanford, California: Teacher Assessment Project.

Tennessee career ladder better schools program. (1984). Nashville: Tennessee State Department.

Professional
Educator Program

as of May 21, 1999

PEP SUMMER 1999
99/00 COHORT CLASS SCHEDULE

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
AM	ED 602 ED in a Pluralistic Society 8:30 - 11:00 Cole C Term	ED 622 Instructional Design & Technology 8:00-12:00 4 cr.hr. C Term	ED 602 ED in a Pluralistic Society 8:30 - 11:30 3 cr. hr. Cole C Term	ED 622 Instructional Design & Technology 8:00 - 12:00 4 cr. hr. C Term	ED 622 Instructional Design & Technology 8:00 - 12:00 4 cr. hr. C Term
PM	ED 621 Human Development 1:00 - 3:30 3 cr. hr. C Term	ED 602 ED in a Pluralistic Society 1 - 3:30 Helms C Term	ED 621 Human Development 1:00 - 3:30 3 cr. hr. C Term	ED 602 ED in a Pluralistic Society 1 - 3:30 Helms C Term	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEP FALL 1999
CLASS SCHEDULE: Elementary

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
AM	EDS 624 (4) Spec. Ed. 9:00 - 12:20 Staff @ 5PTS		ED 614 (1) Field	ED 614 (1) Field	ED 614 (1) Field
PM	ED 606 (4) L.A. I 12:30 - 3:50 Hansell @ 5PTS	ED 608 (3) SS 12:00 - 2:30 Helms @ EJB/WSU			
AFTER SCHOOL	CNL 662 (4) Seminar 4:00 - 7:00 Henderson @ WSU	ED 600 Management 4:00 – 6:30 J.Jahoda/E..Gibbons at Five Points			

PEP FALL 1999
CLASS SCHEDULE: Secondary

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
AM	ED 631 (3) Literacy 9:00-11:30 O'Connor @ Baker	ED 664 (3) Evaluation 9:00 - 11:30 Cole @ Baker	ED 614 (3) Field	ED 614 (3) Field	ED 614 (3) Field
PM	Academic Prep Time				
AFTER SCHOOL	CNL 662 (4) Seminar 4:00 - 7:00 Henderson @ WSU	ED 600 (3) Mngmt 4:00-6:30 J. Jahoda / E. Gibbons At Baker			

* Seminars to discuss academic or applied field strategies might be arranged during this time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEP WINTER 2000
CLASS SCHEDULE: Elementary
Revised November 5, 1999

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
AM	**ED 607 (4) L.A.II @ Five Pts. 10:00 – 12:00 O'Connor**	**ED 610 (6) Science/Math 9:30 – 12:00 @ Five Pts. Tomlin**	ED 616 (1) Field	ED 616 (1) Field	ED 616 (1) Field
PM	**ED 610 (6) Science/Math @ Five Pts. 12:30 – 3 Tomlin**	ED 607 (4) L.A.II @ Five Pts. 12:30 – 2:30 O'Connor			
AFTER SCHOOL		**EDL 670 (3) Seminar @ 168 Rike WSU 4:00 – 6:30 Ryan**		**ED 770 Art & Music @ Five Points 4:20- 6:50** Art: Jennifer Cross Music: Jennifer Gillespie	

PEP WINTER 2000
CLASS SCHEDULE: Secondary

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
AM	*Academic Prep Time		ED 616 (3) Field	ED 616 (3) Field	ED 616 (3) Field
PM	EDS 624 (4) Spc. Ed. 12:30 – 3:00 @ 168 Rike WSU Renick				
AFTER SCHOOL	ED 635 Sec. Issues (3) 4:00 - 7:00 Clemments/Gibbons @ Baker	**EDL 670 (3) Seminar @ 168 Rike WSU 4:00 – 6:30 Ryan** **ED 638(Math Methods) 4:20-6:50 @ 342 Millett WSU**	Sec. Methods Crs.(3) 4:20 - 6:50 *Math People OnlyRegister for: EDL774 in place of EDL 670* 4:20-6:50 Webber @ 347 Millett WSU		

* Seminars to discuss academic or applied field strategies might be arranged during this time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE